

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 9-12, 14-17, 19-22, and 24-26 are pending in this application. Claims 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, and 22 are amended, Claims 13, 18, and 23 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new Claims 24-26 are added herewith. As amended Claims 9, 12, 14, 17, 19, and 22 and new Claims 24-26 are supported by the original disclosure,¹ no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Official Action, Claims 9-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Tsukatani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,257, hereinafter "Tsukatani"); and Claims 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tsukatani in view of Brewer et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,430, hereinafter "Brewer").

Applicants and Applicants' representatives thank Examiner Chu for the courtesy of the interview granted to Applicants' representatives on May 14, 2007. During the interview, differences between Claims 9 and 14 of the present application and Tsukatani were discussed, as well as proposed amendments to Claims 9 and 14. Examiner Chu agreed that proposed amended Claims 9 and 14 as presented herewith appeared to overcome the rejection of record. Examiner Chu also expressed concern regarding the pertinence of file copying methods in computer operating systems and copyright protection methods. Due to the amendment of Claim 9 to include a data compression and encoder circuit configured to compress the digital audio data from the compact disc before the digital audio data is written to the internal memory, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 9 defines over the discussed file copying methods in computer operating systems. With respect to copyright protection

¹See, e.g., the specification at page 10, lines 9-18 and page 11, line 22 to page 12, line 9.

methods, Examiner Chu was agreed that these methods are defined over by the present claims.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), that rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 recites in part:

a reproduction unit configured to reproduce digital audio data from a standard compact disc;
a recording unit configured to write the digital audio data from the standard compact disc to the internal memory;
a control circuit configured to search an information data related to the digital audio data in said internal memory to determine if said digital audio data has been stored in said internal memory, if said control circuit determines that said digital audio data has been stored in said internal memory, said control circuit prohibits writing said digital audio data into said internal memory, and if said control circuit determines that said digital audio data are not stored in said internal memory, said control circuit writes the digital audio data from the standard compact disc to the internal memory; and
a data compression and encoder circuit configured to compress the digital audio data from the compact disc before the digital audio data is written to the internal memory.

In contrast, Tsukatani describes a recording apparatus that records data on the same disc in multiple sessions.² Each session on the disc includes a table of contents area (TOC) which includes the session type (PSEC).³ The outstanding Office Action cited the copying of the TOC of Tsukatani as describing determining whether or not digital data is present in an internal memory.⁴ However, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching or suggestion in Tsukatani for any element that determines if the *content* of data is the same as previously stored content. Tsukatani simply describes the use of a session *type* to determine the difference between different *types* of data recorded in different sessions. Thus, the second and third sessions SS2 and SS3 shown in Figure 2 of Tsukatani could contain *identical* data.

²See Tsukatani, column 3, lines 4-24.

³See Tsukatani, column 6, lines 6-18 and Figures 2 and 3.

⁴See the outstanding Office Action at page 3, lines 5-8.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that there is no teaching in Tsukatani for "a control circuit" as defined in amended Claim 9.


Consequently, as Tsukatani does not teach each and every element of Claim 9, Claim 9 (and Claims 10-13 dependent therefrom) is not anticipated by Tsukatani and is patentable thereover.

Amended Claims 14 and 19 both recite "prohibiting writing said digital audio data into said internal memory if said determining determines that the digital audio data is already stored in said internal memory." As noted above, Tsukatani does not teach or suggest any element that determines if the *content* of data is the same as previously stored content. Therefore, amended Claim 14 (and Claims 15-18 dependent therefrom) is also patentable over Tsukatani. Further, as Brewer also does not teach or suggest this feature, amended Claim 19 (and Claims 20-23 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Tsukatani in view of Brewer.

Accordingly, in view of the present amendment, no further issues are believed to be outstanding and the present application is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Edward W. Tracy, Jr.
Registration No. 47,998